

Modulational and filamentational instabilities of two electromagnetic pulses in a radiation background

Mattias Marklund, Padma K Shukla, Gert Brodin, and
Lennart Stenflo

Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

Abstract. The nonlinear interaction, due to quantum electrodynamical (QED) effects, between two electromagnetic pulses and a radiation gas is investigated. It is found that the governing equations admit both modulational and filamentational instabilities. The instability growth rates are derived, and the results are discussed.

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 95.30.Cq

Within quantum electrodynamics (QED), there are new and interesting phenomena with no classical counterparts. A prominent example is the Casimir effect. Similarly, photon-photon scattering (see, e.g., [1–4]) mediated by virtual electron-positron pairs, does not occur within classical electrodynamics, in which electromagnetic waves in vacuum are indifferent to each other. The collisions of photons with photons have attracted much interest over the years, both from an experimental and an astrophysical point of view (see [5–20] and references therein). The effect of photon-photon scattering could be of fundamental importance in high-intensity laser pulses, in ultra-strong cavity fields, in the surrounding of neutron stars and magnetars, and in the early Universe.

In this paper we shall investigate the interaction between two electromagnetic pulses via a background radiation gas. The gas acts as a mediator of the interaction, and the pulses exchange their energy through this background. Moreover, in contrast to the case with no radiation background, even parallel propagation of the pulses results in non-zero coupling. It is furthermore shown that the resulting system of equations lead to both modulational and filamentational instabilities. Here we present the growth rates for these processes. Our results are finally discussed in the context of astrophysical and laboratory applications.

We express the nonlinear self-interaction of the photons in terms of the Heisenberg–Euler Lagrangian as found in Ref. [1]

$$L = \varepsilon_0 F + \kappa \varepsilon_0^2 [4F^2 + 7G^2], \quad (1)$$

where $F = (E^2 - c^2 B^2)/2$ and $G = c \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$. Here $\kappa \equiv 2\alpha^2 \hbar^3 / 45 m_e^4 c^5 \approx 1.63 \times 10^{-30} \text{ ms}^2/\text{kg}$, α is the fine-structure constant, $\hbar$ is the Planck constant divided by 2π ,

m_e is the electron mass, and c is the speed of light in vacuum. The Lagrangian (1) is valid when there is no electron–positron pair creation, and when the field strength is smaller than the critical field, i.e.

$$\omega \ll m_e c^2 / \hbar, |\mathbf{E}| \ll E_{\text{crit}} \equiv m_e c^2 / e \lambda_c \quad (2)$$

respectively. Here e is the elementary charge, λ_c is the Compton wavelength, and $E_{\text{crit}} \simeq 10^{18} \text{ V/m}$.

Following Ref. [5], we write the dispersion relation for a low energy photon in a background electromagnetic field $(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B})$ as (see also Ref. [15] and references therein)

$$\omega(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}) = c|\mathbf{k}| \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda|\mathbf{Q}|^2\right), \quad (3)$$

where

$$|\mathbf{Q}|^2 = \varepsilon_0 \left[E^2 + c^2 B^2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{E})^2 - c^2 (\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{B})^2 - 2c\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}) \right], \quad (4)$$

and $\lambda = \lambda_{\pm}$, where $\lambda_+ = 14\kappa$ and $\lambda_- = 8\kappa$ for the two different polarisation states of the photon. Furthermore, $\hat{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \mathbf{k}/k$. The approximation $\lambda|\mathbf{Q}|^2 \ll 1$ has been used.

We will below study (a) plane electromagnetic pulses propagating in a background consisting of a radiation gas in equilibrium, and (b) a radiation gas affected by an electromagnetic (EM) pulse propagating through the gas.

The electromagnetic field in Eq. (4) is here a superposition of the fields due to the two coherent electromagnetic pulses, with electric fields $\mathbf{E}_{1,2}(\mathbf{r}, t) \exp[i(\mathbf{k}_{1,2} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \omega_{1,2}t)] + \text{c.c.}$, and the incoherent field due to the photon gas. Here c.c. denotes complex conjugate. The amplitudes of the pulses are supposed to be slowly varying as compared to their rapidly oscillating phases. In the absence of the pulse, the photon gas is assumed to be isotropic. The validity of the Lagrangian requires that the electromagnetic fields are smaller than the critical field. Thus we can use a perturbative approach where the photon gas is only weakly perturbed, i.e., to lowest order in a wave amplitude expansion, the photon gas is still isotropic.

Now we need to establish the connection between the dispersion relation (3) (originally derived for static or slowly varying background fields), and the contribution from the dynamical radiation fields of our problem. Here it is crucial that the QED nonlinearities do not involve the derivatives of the electromagnetic fields. In particular, we may write the general wave equation resulting from the Heisenberg–Euler Lagrangian as

$$\left(\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \right) E_i = \sum_{j,k,l=1}^3 (f_{ijkl} E^j E^k E^l + g_{ijkl} B^j B^k E^l + h_{ijkl} B^j E^k E^l). \quad (5)$$

The specific forms of the tensors f, g and h can be found by comparison with the wave equations in for example Refs. [12, 14]. We note that the nonlinear terms are cubic, i.e. the lowest order scattering processes involve four waves. The coefficient $|\mathbf{Q}|^2$ in (4) results from carrying out all possible summations, where one of the fields in the right hand side is taken as the wave field, and the others as the constant fields, and finally taking the scalar product with the polarization vector. However,

for combinatorial reasons, the coefficient of interaction becomes the same for waves influenced by background fields that are dynamical waves. This can be seen by noting that the combination surviving the wave mixing is obtained by taking one field as the original wave, the other as a wave field at a different frequency and the third as its complex conjugate $\ddagger$. Other combinations surviving the wave mixing are ruled out by the conservation relations.

Next we substitute the particular fields into (4) in order to evaluate their effects on the dispersion relation (3). Here we note that the rapidly oscillating contributions to $|\mathbf{Q}|^2$ should not be included, i.e., terms proportional to $\mathbf{E}_1 \cdot \mathbf{E}_2 \exp[i((\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2) \cdot \mathbf{r} - (\omega_1 + \omega_2)t)]$, $\mathbf{E}_1^2 \exp[2i(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r} - \omega_1 t)]$ etc. can be neglected, since in Eq. (3) such terms will be averaged out. Thus the only terms kept in the expression for $|\mathbf{Q}|^2$ are proportional either to the photon gas density or to the slowly varying intensity in one of the pulses. We note that our calculation of the effect of the pulses on the photon gas requires the intensities to vary on a long scale as compared to the wavelengths of the gas photons.

For case (a), the relations $(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_i \cdot \mathbf{E})^2 = E^2/3$, $(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_i \cdot \mathbf{B})^2 = B^2/3$, and $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} = 0$ hold, where $\mathbf{k}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, stands for the pulse wavevectors. Hence, from (4) we obtain

$$|\mathbf{Q}_1|^2 = \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{E}_g + \alpha_1\mathcal{E}_2, \quad (6)$$

$$|\mathbf{Q}_2|^2 = \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{E}_g + \alpha_2\mathcal{E}_1, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_g = \varepsilon_0(E^2 + c^2B^2)/2$ and $\mathcal{E}_i = \varepsilon_0|E_i|^2$ is the energy density of the radiation gas and pulse i , respectively. Using $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i = \mathbf{E}_i/|E_i|$, we have defined

$$\alpha_{1,2} = 2 - 2\hat{\mathbf{k}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}_2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{1,2} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{2,1})^2 - [(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{1,2} \times \hat{\mathbf{k}}_{2,1}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{2,1}]^2. \quad (8)$$

In case (b), the directions $\hat{\mathbf{k}}_g$ of the photons in the gas are approximately random. The last statement holds true as long as the pulse energy densities are small, thus inducing only weak deviations from the equilibrium values of the radiation gas quantities. The error in this approximation is therefore only of first order in the pulse energy densities, giving a second order correction in the final equations. Then (4) yields

$$|\mathbf{Q}_g|^2 = \frac{4}{3} \left(\mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 + \beta \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1 \mathcal{E}_2} \right), \quad (9)$$

where we have introduced the parameter

$$\beta = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_2 + (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}_2) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_2)(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1). \quad (10)$$

With the relations (6)–(7), we use standard methods for slowly varying envelopes [21] to derive the dynamical equations for two pulses on a photon gas background, to obtain

$$i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{01} \cdot \nabla \right) \mathbf{E}_1 + \frac{c}{2k_{01}} \left[\nabla^2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{01} \cdot \nabla)^2 \right] \mathbf{E}_1 + \lambda ck_{01} \left(\frac{2}{3}\mathcal{E}_g + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1\mathcal{E}_2 \right) \mathbf{E}_1 = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{02} \cdot \nabla \right) \mathbf{E}_2 + \frac{c}{2k_{02}} \left[\nabla^2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{02} \cdot \nabla)^2 \right] \mathbf{E}_2 + \lambda ck_{02} \left(\frac{2}{3}\mathcal{E}_g + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_2\mathcal{E}_1 \right) \mathbf{E}_2 = 0, \quad (12)$$

$\ddagger$ One notes that an overall factor two enters, because of the contributions from the terms where the wave field changes place with the complex conjugate term. However, this is compensated for by using the time averaged values of the fields rather than the peak amplitudes.

where the index 0 refers to the non-interacting background state. We note that if the two pulses are co-propagating, their mutual interactions disappear, while for counter-propagating pulses we have $\alpha_i = 4$.

Following Ref. [19] and using (9), we then derive the equations for the radiation gas on a background of two plane wave pulses (assuming that the rate of change in the direction of the pulses is slow)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_g}{\partial t} + c^2 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi} = & \frac{4}{3} \lambda \left[\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_2}{\mathcal{E}_1}} \right) \left(-\frac{\mathcal{E}_g}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c^2 \mathbf{\Pi} \cdot \nabla \right) \mathcal{E}_1 \right. \\ & \left. + \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_1}{\mathcal{E}_2}} \right) \left(-\frac{\mathcal{E}_g}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c^2 \mathbf{\Pi} \cdot \nabla \right) \mathcal{E}_2 + c^2 \left(\mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 + \beta \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1 \mathcal{E}_2} \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{\Pi}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{3} \nabla \mathcal{E}_g = \frac{2}{3} \lambda \mathcal{E}_g \left[\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_2}{\mathcal{E}_1}} \right) \nabla \mathcal{E}_1 + \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_1}{\mathcal{E}_2}} \right) \nabla \mathcal{E}_2 \right], \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is the momentum density of the photon gas. The coupled equations (11)–(12) and (13)–(14) describe the momentum exchange due to wave–wave scattering of the high frequency pulses and the low frequency gas photons. We note that Eqs. (13)–(14) have been derived by taking moments of the Vlasov equation for the radiation gas photons. We have chosen to start from an effective Lagrangian for the photon–photon interaction, but one could in principle also start from the scattering cross section of the elastic photon–photon collisions, forming a collisional integral of the Boltzmann equation, and from there derive the fluid equations. However, for the purposes of this paper, the Vlasov approach is sufficient.

Introducing $\mathcal{E}_g = \mathcal{E}_0 + \delta \mathcal{E}$, where $\mathcal{E}_0 (\gg \delta \mathcal{E})$ is the unperturbed radiation gas energy density in the absence of the pulses, and assuming that the unperturbed momentum density of the gas vanishes, we obtain from Eqs. (13)–(14)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \delta \mathcal{E}}{\partial t^2} - \frac{c^2}{3} \nabla^2 \delta \mathcal{E} = & -\frac{2}{3} \lambda \mathcal{E}_0 \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_2}{\mathcal{E}_1}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + c^2 \nabla^2 \right) \mathcal{E}_1 \right. \\ & + \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_1}{\mathcal{E}_2}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + c^2 \nabla^2 \right) \mathcal{E}_2 \\ & - \frac{\beta}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_2}{\mathcal{E}_1^3}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_1}{\partial t} \right)^2 + c^2 |\nabla \mathcal{E}_1|^2 \right] - \frac{\beta}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_1}{\mathcal{E}_2^3}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_2}{\partial t} \right)^2 + c^2 |\nabla \mathcal{E}_2|^2 \right] \\ & \left. + \frac{\beta}{2 \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1 \mathcal{E}_2}} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_1}{\partial t} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_2}{\partial t} + c^2 (\nabla \mathcal{E}_1) \cdot (\nabla \mathcal{E}_2) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Equation (15) together with Eqs. (11)–(12) form a Karpman-like system of equations [22–25].

In order to analyse modulational instabilities, we proceed along the lines of Ref. [26] and let $\delta \mathcal{E} = \tilde{\delta \mathcal{E}} \exp[i(\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \Omega t)]$ and $\mathcal{E}_j = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j \exp[i(\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \Omega t)]$ where $j = 1, 2$. From

Eq. (15) we then obtain

$$\widetilde{\delta\mathcal{E}} = \frac{2}{3}\lambda\mathcal{E}_0\Delta\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_2 + \beta\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_1\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_2}\right), \quad (16)$$

where $\Delta = (\Omega^2 + c^2K^2)/(-\Omega^2 + c^2K^2/3)$.

In the absence of the radiation gas, the interaction between co-propagating pulses vanishes. This is not the case when the radiation gas is present, as will now be shown. For parallel propagation, we have $\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{01} = \hat{\mathbf{k}}_{02} = \hat{\mathbf{k}}_0$, and $\nabla^2 - (\hat{\mathbf{k}}_0 \cdot \nabla)^2 = \nabla_\perp^2$. Furthermore, parallel pulses imply $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, i.e., the Eqs. (11)–(12) take the form

$$i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c\hat{\mathbf{k}}_0 \cdot \nabla\right)\mathbf{E}_j + \frac{c}{2k_{0j}}\nabla_\perp^2\mathbf{E}_j + \frac{2}{3}\lambda ck_{0j}\mathcal{E}_0\left[1 + \frac{2}{3}\lambda\mathcal{E}_0\Delta(|E_1|^2 + |E_2|^2 + \beta|E_1||E_2|)\right]\mathbf{E}_j = 0, \quad (17)$$

where we have used Eq. (16). The modulational instability of Eqs. (17) will now be analysed, using the ansatz $\mathbf{E}_j = (\mathbf{E}_{j0} + \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j)e^{i\varphi_j t}$, where $|\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j| \ll |\mathbf{E}_{j0}|$, and where $\mathbf{E}_{j0}$ is a real constant vector. To lowest order, Eq. (17) gives the frequency shift $\varphi_j = \frac{2}{3}\lambda ck_{0j}\mathcal{E}_0\left[1 + \frac{2}{3}\lambda\mathcal{E}_0\Delta(E_{10}^2 + E_{20}^2 + \beta E_{10}E_{20})\right]$, and to next order we obtain

$$i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c\hat{\mathbf{k}}_0 \cdot \nabla\right)\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j + \frac{c}{2k_{0j}}\nabla_\perp^2\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j + \varepsilon_0 W_j\left[(\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_1 + \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_1^*) \cdot \mathbf{E}_{10} + (\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_2 + \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_2^*) \cdot \mathbf{E}_{20}\right]\mathbf{E}_{j0} = 0, \quad (18)$$

where the star denotes the complex conjugate, and $W_j = (4/9)\lambda^2 ck_{0j}\mathcal{E}_0\Delta$.

To further simplify the analysis, we assume that $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_{j0} = \widetilde{E}_j E_{j0}$, and that the polarisation of the perturbation vectors remain fixed to lowest order, and set $k_{01} = k_{02} = k_0$. We let $\widetilde{E}_j = (X_j + iY_j)\exp[i(\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \Omega t)]$, and Fourier analyse Eq. (18) to obtain

$$(\Omega - cK_\parallel)^4 - \frac{cK_\perp^2}{k_0}\left[\frac{cK_\perp^2}{2k_0} - W\mathcal{E}_p\right](\Omega - cK_\parallel)^2 + \frac{c^3K_\perp^6}{4k_0^3}\left[\frac{cK_\perp^2}{4k_0} - W\mathcal{E}_p\right] = 0, \quad (19)$$

where $W = W_1 = W_2$, $\mathcal{E}_p = \varepsilon_0(E_{10}^2 + E_{20}^2)$, $K_\parallel = \hat{\mathbf{k}}_0 \cdot \mathbf{K}$ and $K_\perp^2 = K^2 - K_\parallel^2$. Thus, for $\Omega = cK_\parallel + i\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \ll cK_\parallel$, we find that

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{1}{2}cK_\perp\sqrt{\frac{16}{3}\eta_0\eta_p\frac{K_\perp^2 + 2K_\parallel^2}{K_\perp^2 - 2K_\parallel^2} - \frac{K_\perp^2}{k_0^2}}, \quad (20)$$

where the dimensionless parameters $\eta_0 = \lambda\mathcal{E}_0$ and $\eta_p = \lambda\mathcal{E}_p$ give the coupling strength for the radiation gas and the pulse, respectively. Thus, we see that the radiation gas acts as a mediator for the energy transfer between the two pulses, something that is not possible with the pulses alone. The positivity of Γ^2 requires that

$$K_\parallel^2 > \frac{K_\perp^2}{2}\frac{(3K_\perp^2 - 16k_0^2\eta_0\eta_p)}{(3K_\perp^2 + 16k_0^2\eta_0\eta_p)} \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

We furthermore notice that the growth rate diverges when $K_\parallel$ approaches the “critical” value $\pm K_\perp/\sqrt{2}$, at which the approximation $\Gamma \ll cK_\parallel$ breaks down. On the other

hand, even if the parameters η_0 and η_p are small, one can nevertheless obtain a large growth rate, provided that $K_{\parallel}$ lies close to $\pm K_{\perp}/\sqrt{2}$. The phase speed at the critical wavenumber is $c/\sqrt{3}$, i.e. the speed of sound in a thermal radiation gas.

A stationary filamentation instability can likewise be obtained from Eq. (17), analogously to the modulational instability. If $K_{\parallel} = i\chi$, we obtain

$$\chi = \frac{1}{2}K_{\perp}\sqrt{\frac{16}{3}\eta_0\eta_p - \frac{K_{\perp}^2}{k_0^2}}. \quad (22)$$

Notice that, contrary to the modulational instability, the filamentational instability growth rate does not have a singular behaviour at certain parameter values.

The existence of a modulational and/or filamentational instability within a physical system indicates that the nonlinear evolution, either in time or in space, is nontrivial. When the time-dependence is significant, the modulational instability implies that any small perturbation will grow. We therefore expect the system to evolve towards a strongly inhomogeneous state. Naturally higher order nonlinearities are likely to saturate such a collapse scenario. On longer time-scales thermo-dynamical effects, outside the range of validity of our equations, will become important. This is likely to eventually destroy the inhomogeneous structures. Even if the system is stationary, the filamentational instability will single out a spatial direction along which inhomogeneities will grow. Here, a full nonlinear analysis requires numerical methods. We note that, in addition to the modulational and/or filamentational instabilities considered here, four-wave scattering involving only high frequency photons is possible. However, for dimensional reasons we expect the growth rates associated with such processes to be smaller than the ones found here, provided that $\eta_0 > \eta_p$.

The situations in which photon–photon scattering can become important are indeed in the extreme range of what Nature may offer. Although the evolution of high power lasers has been rapid over the last decades, we are still not near the limits where the direct effect of lasers can give us important information of photon–photon scatterings. Rather, this has to be sought by more indirect means, such as the coherent interactions of cavity modes presented in Ref. [14], or in astrophysical environments, such as close to magnetars (see, e.g., Ref. [27]), where field strengths close to the Schwinger limit may exist, and effects such as photon splitting or magnetic lensing, as found in Ref. [5–7, 16], may take place. Moreover, the possibility of using recent high precision measurements of the cosmic microwave background, such as the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (see Ref. [28]), for the indirect detection of photon–photon scatterings has also been suggested in Ref. [19].

In this paper we have suggested a theory for pairs of electromagnetic pulses propagating on a radiation background. It has been shown that the dynamics of the photon pulses is governed by a set of coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, while the response of the background can be deduced from an acoustic wave equation driven by the pressure of the two photon pulses. The full system resembles a Karpman set of equations. Moreover, we have investigated the interaction between two parallel

propagating electromagnetic pulses via a background radiation gas. The gas acts as a mediator for the interaction, and the pulses exchange their energy through this background. In contrast to the case of no radiation background, when parallel propagation implies zero coupling, the radiation gas in our case gives rise to a system of equations possessing both modulational and filamentational instabilities. We have presented the temporal and spatial amplification rates for both instabilities, and have discussed the implications of these instabilities for the evolution of the system, both in laboratory settings and in astrophysical environments.

References

- [1] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, *Z. Phys.* **98** 714 (1936).
- [2] V.S. Weisskopf, K. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk. Mat. Fy. Medd. **14** 1 (1936).
- [3] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **82** 664 (1951).
- [4] W. Greiner, B.Müller and J. Rafelski, *Quantum electrodynamics of strong fields* (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
- [5] Z. Bialynicka-Birula and I. Bialynicki-Birula, *Phys. Rev. D* **2** 2341 (1970).
- [6] S.L. Adler, *Ann. Phys.-NY* **67** 599 (1971).
- [7] A.K. Harding, *Science* **251** 1033 (1991).
- [8] A.E. Kaplan and Y.J. Ding, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 043805 (2000).
- [9] J.I. Latorre, P. Pascual and R. Tarrach, *Nucl. Phys. B* **437** 60 (1995).
- [10] D.A. Dicus, C. Kao and W.W. Repko, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** 2443 (1998).
- [11] Y.J. Ding and A.E. Kaplan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** 2725 (1989).
- [12] M. Soljačić and M. Segev, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 043817 (2000).
- [13] G. Brodin, L. Stenflo, D. Anderson, M. Lisak, M. Marklund and P. Johannisson, *Phys. Lett. A* **306** 206 (2003).
- [14] G. Brodin, M. Marklund and L. Stenflo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 171801 (2001).
- [15] G. Boillat, *J. Math. Phys.* **11** 941 (1970).
- [16] J.S. Heyl and L. Hernquist, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30** 6485 (1997).
- [17] V.A. De Lorenci, R. Klippert, M. Novello and J.M. Salim, *Phys. Lett. B* **482** 134 (2000).
- [18] M.H. Thoma, *Europh. Lett.* **52** 498 (2000).
- [19] M. Marklund, G. Brodin and L. Stenflo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 163601 (2003).
- [20] B. Shen and M.Y. Yu, *Phys. Plasmas* **10** 4570 (2003).
- [21] A. Hasegawa, *Plasma Instabilities and Nonlinear Effects* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975).
- [22] V.I. Karpman, *Plasma Phys.* **13** 477 (1971).
- [23] V.E. Zakharov, *Sov. Phys.-JETP* **35** 908 (1972).
- [24] V.I. Karpman, *Phys. Scr.* **11** 263 (1975).
- [25] V.I. Karpman, *Nonlinear Waves in Dispersive Media* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1975).
- [26] P.K. Shukla, *Phys. Scr.* **45** 618 (1992).
- [27] C. Kouveliotou, S. Dieters, T. Strohmayer *et al.*, *Nature* **393** 235 (1998).
- [28] URL <http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/mm.html>